

**From:** [Wyatt, Robert](#)  
**To:** [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#)  
**Cc:** ['johnt@windwardenv.com'](#); [Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); ['jworonets@anchorenv.com'](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Benthic Risk Evaluation  
**Date:** 01/12/2010 11:01 PM

---

Thanks Eric, we will discuss this at our Exec meeting tomorrow morning and I will give you an update at the Harbor Managers meeting tomorrow afternoon.

Bob

---

**From:** Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov <Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov>  
**To:** Wyatt, Robert  
**Cc:** johnt@windwardenv.com <johnt@windwardenv.com>; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov <Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov>; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov <Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov>; jworonets@anchorenv.com <jworonets@anchorenv.com>  
**Sent:** Tue Jan 12 22:58:37 2010  
**Subject:** Benthic Risk Evaluation

Bob, I understand that John Toll and Burt Shephard have set up a meeting for Friday, January 22, 2010 to allow John the opportunity to present the benthic risk evaluation and allow the government team the opportunity to ask questions about the approach.

As you are aware, the benthic risk evaluation is an important component of the baseline ecological risk assessment. Further, EPA and the LWG have had many discussions about the benthic risk evaluation in the past. I believe that having this meeting is an important step towards resolving and finalizing the benthic risk evaluation.

Towards that end, some of our benthic risk evaluation reviewers have identified some additional data needs to facilitate our review. This goes beyond the information that was provided on November 11, 2009 pursuant to our October 9, 2009 request.

1) We need to ensure that we have the final versions of outputs of all of logistic regression model runs performed as part of the benthic risk evaluation. This includes models that were run but rejected as not being predictive of toxicity for one reason or another. We have the older versions, but not the newest ones with the correct (at least according to us) reference envelope definition. The correct reference envelope definition affects all of the hit / no hit definitions, thus affecting all of the model output and predictions.

2) In order to finish the review of the Portland Harbor SQGs, we need the floating point files from the EPA 2009 model. Although the files were submitted for the original "draft BERA" model (the LWG's recommended model) files should also be submitted for the EPA 2009 model. This will facilitate agency review of the hit / no hit distributions using the new reference envelope definitions. The submittal should include model runs for each individual endpoint, including *Hyalella* biomass. The "Reanalysis Memo" excluded this endpoint from the final EPA 2009 model results.

It would be helpful if this information can be provided prior to the January 22, 2010 meeting. If you have any questions about this request, please have John Toll contact Burt Shephard directly.

Thanks, Eric

